

We are united in opposing the installation of a Sprint wireless site at 800 Carlisle (file number 2004-0863). We are appealing to the City Council to overturn the approval given by the Planning Commission. Thank you.

Signature	Name	Address
1	Uli Palli	824 Coventry Ct.
2	Betha Boungerther Christine Palli	824 Coventry Ct.
3	Mei-Ling Shek-Stefan	820 Coventry Ct.
4	Peter M. Stefan	820 Coventry Ct.
5	Paul Healy	823 Coventry Ct.
6	Terry Grossman	816 Coventry Ct.
7	Charles Grossman	816 Coventry Ct.
8	Shars Ziemelis	812 Coventry Ct.
9	<u>BAIBA ZIEMELES</u>	812 Coventry Ct.
10	Mary McLearn	827 Coventry Ct.
11	Robert McLearn	827 Coventry Ct.
12	Katherine Foist	1403 Kingfisher Way
13	<u>Thomas O. Caila</u>	1403 Kingfisher Way
14	John Ameling	819 Coventry Ct.
15	Susan Charbonneau	819 Coventry Ct.
16	Bala Venkat	1409 Kingfisher Way
17	Sumita Jayaraman	1409 Kingfisher Way
18	Robert Hoop	1439 Kingfisher Way
19	<u>Lili Wen</u>	<u>1432 K.</u>
20	<u>2</u>	<u>1421 Kingfisher Wy.</u>


We are united in opposing the installation of a Sprint wireless site at 800 Carlisle (file number 2004-0863). We are appealing to the City Council to overturn the approval given by the Planning Commission. Thank you.

Signature	Name	Address
1	Aleee Pyle	1394 Lillian Ave
2	Meera Nandakumar	1393 Lillian
3	Karen Zubillaba	1380 Lillian
4	<u>K. Zubillaga</u>	1380 Lillian
5	(Karen R. Lehman	1386 Lillian
6	Robert G. Loftis	1387 Lillian
7	<u>Somsong Vongelunon</u>	1375 Lillian
8	Steven Houser	1369 Lillian
9	May Wang	1357 Lillian
10	Iva L. Hendrix	1356 Lillian
11	<u>1358 Lillian</u>	
12	<u>Anne Barney</u> <u>Roger Bueley</u>	1339 Lillian
13	<u>Paul Lehman</u>	1386 Lillian
14	<u>George Clark</u>	1363 Lillian
15	<u>Daryl Clark</u>	1363 Lillian
16	<u>Tanya Carpenter</u>	1350 Lillian
17	<u>June Lee</u>	1338 Lillian
18	<u>NANDAKUMAR SUNDAR</u>	1393 LILLIAN
19	<u>Mary Ann</u>	1381 Lillian Ave
20		

ATTACHMENT 4

Page 3 of 15

We are united in opposing the installation of a Sprint wireless site at 800 Carlisle (file number 2004-0863). We are appealing to the City Council to overturn the approval given by the Planning Commission. Thank you.

	Signature	Name	Address
1		Toik Yamashita	1408 Kingfisher Way
2		Glenn Clara Yamashita	1408 Kingfisher Way
3		Mary Lou Coehero	1421 Kingfisher Way (signed on dec 01)
4		RAGHU SRINIVASAN	1415 Kingfisher Way
5		Kristina J. Phatak	1427 Kingfisher Way
6		TUSHAR SALVI	1458 KINGFISHER WAY
7		MILLICENT YEO	1452 KINGFISHER WAY
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			

ATTACHMENT H

4 of 15

We are united in opposing the installation of a Sprint wireless site at 800 Carlisle (file number 2004-0863). We are appealing to the City Council to overturn the approval given by the Planning Commission. Thank you.

Signature	Name	Address
1	Rowena Caban	1393 Arleen
2	Monna Meng	1380 Arleen
3	Steven Barton	1380 Arleen
4	Kim Thurgate	1363 Arleen
5	Linda Dysart	1368 Arleen
6	Adrian Lidia Popovici	1350 Arleen
7	Robert Gerral	1339 Arleen
8	Usha Amin	1332 Arleen (no longer lives here)
9	Gaby Decker David G. Baker	1363 Pauline
10	Arthur S. Kushner	732 Glencoe Ct
11	Roberta Kushner	732 Glencoe Ct
12	Masayo Hirayama	1402 Harrier Ct
13	Kim Kaila	1382 Flicker Way
14	Yagil Hertzberg	655 Carlisle Way
15	Adam Dysart	1368 Arleen
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		

File 2004-0863

820 Coventry Ct.,
Sunnyvale, CA 94087.
2005 March 14

Dear Council:

I shall first explain why I am against the tree-pole at 800 Carlisle. Then I should share with you the context of our petition.

I am against the tree-pole for the following reasons: (1) I do not wish to have a tall unsightly structure dominating the scene in front of my house. (2) I fully sympathize with my neighbors who live even closer to the tree-pole. (3) The tree-pole would degrade the quality of the neighborhood. (4) I am concerned about the possibility that a repeater site is just the first step towards a full cellular site that would have serious implications, not just for our neighborhood, but also for city guidelines.

The first three reasons come under the category of aesthetics. The approved tree-pole would fail a "blend-in" test at a large distance and would, at a shorter range, fail another "visual" test in addition. My husband and I went to Miller and Stevens Creek, to see how easy or difficult it would be to identify a tree-pole. We did not know where it really was, or what to expect. We decided we would park the car and walk around. As soon as we got out of the car, Peter said, "There it is!" Then I saw it too - or just the tip of it, above the tops of some trees. Even at a large distance it was unmistakably different from a live tree, probably because of the unnatural green color of the artificial foliage. Upon closer approach, at about 200 ft or so, the antennas and cables near the top jumped into view. Even if one mentally blocked out the unsightly antennas and cables, the tree-pole looked out of place not just because of the color of the artificial foliage, but also because of its disproportionately large trunk. At 100 ft or so, one could see certain details in the construction, such as the joints on the trunk where the artificial branches were slipped on. It seemed to me to be a visually sloppy job. This tree-pole was 55 ft tall, and the artificial foliage started at about 10 ft above ground level - a modern tree-pole. I realized that the tree-pole stood out so well because there were nearby trees that provided a visual reference, and contrast. Such a tree-pole would even stand out more at 800 Carlisle because the trees in its immediate vicinity are much shorter.

There may be a tendency for decision-makers to view the tree-pole in visual relation to the facilities which already exist at that location. However, I feel that the tree-pole should be viewed in relation to the trees nearby. A common sentiment I have heard, especially on Lillian, is something like: "We don't want any more ugliness around here!"

Serious policy issues may arise, in addition to more aesthetics problems in the neighborhood, if a repeater site is the first step towards a full cellular site. A possible motivation for developing a full cellular site at 800 Carlisle may be the elimination, or sale, of the site at 958 El Camino Real, which is only 1/2 mile away. (I have read that Sprint is planning to sell cellular towers to Global Signal.) I may be wrong, but I feel that this would be going beyond the purpose of better serving Sprint customers in the super-

block. Furthermore, this would mean that effectively a telecom company could be migrating a roof-mounted site in a commercial zone to a free-standing structure in a residential zone. One does not know what such a precedent may lead to.

Although we have suggested better utilization of commercial zones, it may still be determined that a site within the super-block is the only solution for better service to Sprint customers. If city staff from two divisions and the applicant can work together in Ortega Park, then my fears stated above will be groundless. I hope my fears will be groundless.

Co-location of other carriers would be problematic at 800 Carlisle. Although the approved tree-pole technically provides provisions for the co-location of two additional carriers, it is not clear if other carriers would be happy with antenna heights which are not as competitive as the applicant's. Given my observations at the Planning Commission hearing, I am concerned that one 55 ft tree-pole may naturally beget a couple of other 55 ft tree-poles, or may be substituted by a 65 ft tree-pole in the future. At Ortega Park, the two tallest light fixtures have the same height. Moreover, if the two divisions of Parks & Recreation and Planning work together, there will be checks and balances.

In January this year, we were ignorant about many things. Only four persons went to the first informational meeting. My husband went in spite of the pouring rain that night. I did not realize the significance of meeting attendance, until I went to the hearing by the Planning Commission. There was a petition signed by sixty residents, but only five of us went to the hearing at which approval was given to the applicant's proposal. We had no organization, and no knowledge of what we should have done. In my recent effort to contact residents in the neighborhood who had signed that petition, I came across quite a number of people who could not believe that their signatures meant next to nothing unless they would attend meetings. This was just something we learnt - the hard way.

We have a new petition because it is appropriate to have an updated one. Within the time available, some of the residents who signed the old petition could not be reached. There were three who changed their minds and did not support our appeal to Council. No new additions were sought, except in the cases when the neighbors said "Go to so-and-so". But on the whole, the new petition has reproduced the data in the old one.

I did not ask any visitor to Panama Park about their opinions, since my priority was to get back to the residents who would be most affected by the tree-pole. However, I included a few residents who signed the old petition while they were at Panama Park. I learnt that after I walked past many houses to find out why they should care about a tree-pole quite far away. It turned out that they too, thought there was enough "messiness" around. One person noted that he did not equate wireless access with an improved quality of life.

Thank you for reading this letter.

Sincerely,

Mei-Ling Shek-Stefan

March 9, 2005

Dear Council,

I am writing to you as a concerned home owner at 1394 Lillian ave. I live directly across the street from the property that is being considered as a site for one of the tree-pole towers to be used as a transmitter for cell phones.

These are such unsightly towers to be placed in a residential neighborhood. I can only imagine what might happen to our property values.

Please consider these concerns from a resident at this address since July, 1950.

Thank you,

ATTACHMENT #

Page 8 of 5

File 2004-0863

This letter was dictated to Mei-Ling Shek-Stefan on March 11 by Iva Hendrix, who said she needed help.

1356 Lillian

Dear Council:

I do not like the looks of a tree-pole. I am afraid it will develop into more problems later. I am worried that it will have the wrong effect on the sale of the house.

I have to take care of my invalid son and cannot go to the meeting.

I have lived here since June 1st, 1950.

827 Coventry Court
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
March 12, 2005

Sunnyvale City Council:

I am deeply concerned about the proposal to construct a 55-foot artificial tree pole at 800 Carlisle, in our residential (R1) neighborhood. My property shares its back yard fence with 800 Carlisle.

Many afternoons and evenings I relax in my back yard, enjoying the shapes and colors of nature. I do not count the shape and color of an artificial tree pole among those pleasures. Artificial tree poles are exactly that: artificial in shape and color and quite ugly. At 800 Carlisle, the tree pole would rise dramatically above the existing landscape, broadcasting its intrusion and shattering the beautiful view. What a dramatic degradation of the esthetics of our neighborhood such an artificial pole would represent!

I urge you to place this cellular facility in a more appropriate place, in a commercial area it would not degrade or on an existing pole where its impact would be limited.

Regards,

Mary E. McLearn

Paul Healy
823 Coventry Court
Sunnyvale, California, 94087

ATTACHMENT 4
Page 10 of 15

March 14, 2005

Honorable Mayor and Council Members
City of Sunnyvale
456 W. Olive Ave
Sunnyvale CA 94086

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to urge Council to reject the application by Sprint PCS for a use permit for a 55 foot tall monopole at 800 Carlisle. This artificial tree will be approximately 20 feet taller than the surrounding trees on the site and will dominate the views from our neighborhood. I and many of my neighbors are concerned that this facility will have a negative impact on property values in the immediate area. We have contacted several realtors all of whom have stated that they would advise clients to disclose the presence of a such a facility at the time of a real estate sale.

I would like to point out that this facility would violate design requirements for wireless communication facilities established in section 19.54.040 of the City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code in at least three aspects:

This facility will be readily visible from the nearest residentially zoned property. (19.54.040 p)

A new freestanding tower is proposed when there exist viable alternatives that would allow mounting the antenna on existing structures. (19.54.040 a)

At 55 feet in height this tree pole violates the setback requirement of two feet for every foot in height. (19.54.040 p)

Alternative sites exist in this area that would better conform to City code. One such site, Ortega Park, would allow placement of the wireless antenna on an existing light fixture thus conforming to the municipal code and mitigating any visual impact. The light standard is located at a distance greater than 300 feet from inhabited areas thus eliminating the need for regular testing for emissions exposure (municipal code 19.54.150 c). Associated ground equipment could easily be placed in an underground vault, or the unsightly bleachers at this site could be rebuilt and the ground equipment placed underneath. The Ortega park site has the additional advantage of generating lease revenue for the City.

I urge Council to deny the use permit for the 800 Carlisle site.

Sincerely,

Paul Healy

ATTACHMENT 4

Page 15 of 15

From: "Pete McCrorie"
To: <citymgr@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us>
Date: 12/4/2004 10:39:13 PM
Subject: Atrocious cell phone service in Sunnyvale

I am not sure whether you realize it, but Sunnyvale currently gets extremely poor cell phone service from most, if not all, of the major cell phone service providers (Verizon might be the exception).

I was recently on an AT&T plan and unable to get any reasonable signal at my house on Flicker Way. I was recently told by a Cingular representative that their reception was better than the AT&T reception, and that I should switch carriers. Unfortunately, but as I expected, the reception did not improve with Cingular, in fact it now appears worse. The problem is that I don't seem to have much choice.

While researching dead spots in cellular service, I uncovered many from the Sunnyvale area, and found out that this is a known phenomenon for many years. This leads me to some questions for you:

1. Is the city of Sunnyvale aware of this problem?
2. Has the city compounded the problem by restricting the building on new cell phone towers within our city limits?
3. Will the city be willing to "go to bat" for its residents, to get improved coverage?
4. If the answer to #3 is yes, when can we expect to get some focus on this issue?

I feel that one of the key measures of being a "great place to live" is the ability of residents to get services that are at least on par with other cities in the general area. Unfortunately, it would appear that Sunnyvale is pretty low on the list when it comes to cell phone coverage. I need a cell phone for my employment, and it is really restricting and frustrating to have such poor service at my house, which limits my ability to do my job effectively.

I look forward to your responses.

Thanks

Pete McCrorie
Sunnyvale

March 13, 2005
820 Coventry Court
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Sunnyvale City Council
456 West Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94088

Dear Sunnyvale City Council,

I am writing to try to convince you to overturn the Planning Commission decision on case 2004-0863 to grant a Use Permit to Sprint PCS for a cellular telecommunications site on the California Water Service Company property at 800 Carlisle Way.

Essentially, I want to encourage you to take a greater role in the selection of telecommunications sites, especially when the sites involve residential neighborhoods. This involves taking a "long-term" view, which recognizes that there are multiple telecommunications companies (carriers), whose needs must be independently satisfied, and that the needs we see today may well expand in the future, as existing services expand and new services enter the marketplace.

I think that you should pre-select the "most-capable" sites within each residential neighborhood, and offer these locations to the carriers for their facilities, with the definite implication that other sites in the neighborhoods are "off limits". Such an approach, when the sites have been carefully chosen, should minimize the negative impacts of telecommunications facilities on the surrounding residential properties, and maximize the effectiveness of the facilities themselves, while further providing for co-location of multiple carriers at a single site.

Clearly, I have something in mind when I mention "most-capable sites", and this may be a point of some debate. I maintain that the "most-capable sites" in residential communities would generally be public parks and schools. Such parcels of land are often the largest parcels in a residential neighborhood. They would often allow a telecommunications facility to be placed far from individual residential properties. This minimizes the negative impact of the facility on these properties, both from an aesthetic point of view, and from its influence on the future sale of private properties (some buyers are, at the present time, hesitant to consider a property near a telecommunications facility). Secondly, such parcels often contain taller structures than the surrounding homes: buildings, lighting fixtures, structures for athletic fields, etc. These provide a preferred location for the facility antennas (see postscript). Finally, larger parcels offer the best chance for co-location of multiple carriers; there may be multiple structures suitable for antennas and adequate land area for multiple sets of ground-based support equipment (also see postscript).

In my opinion, sites in commercial and industrial zones do not present nearly the problem that residential zones present. Building facades, suitable for concealed mounting of the antennas, are more readily available. Also, the aesthetic and property value issues may be less important, such that even an un-concealed tower with "top-hat" antenna array may be acceptable.

But returning to the issue of residential sites, the parcel at 800 Carlisle Way does not meet the criteria stated above. It is too small and may be unsuitable for co-location

ATTACHMENT 4

PAGE 13 OF 15

of the entire group of existing carriers. Residential properties are barely more than 100 feet away.

Therefore, I hope that you will uphold the appeal and overturn the use permit granted in case 2004-0863.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Stefan

Postscript:

I'd like to further support some of the comments above. First, the height of the facility antenna really seems to make a difference! Looking at page 1 of Attachment I from the Planning Commission Report, one can see the areas around each of Sprint's cellular base station sites in which excellent signal strength is expected. Look at the site mounted on the 3-story Friendship Inn on El Camino Real, near Wolfe (F904XC154). Surrounded by buildings of similar height, it is not very effective. In contrast, the site at Braly Park (SF33XC550) covers some 7 times the area, and a larger area than any other site on the map. We were curious about what makes this site so good, and visited the park to see. It's height! One edge of Braly Park has a row of PG&E lattice towers. Both Sprint and Cingular have cellular sites in these. Their base station equipment is located under the towers, between the footings. Cingular places their antennas half way or 2/3rds the way up the towers, but Sprint got smart! They made their own double lattice box extension to hold their antennas, and placed it at the very top of the lattice tower, above all the PG&E wires. It must be over 90 feet above ground (something like nine stories!). I'm convinced that this is why their signal is so effective from this site. Incidentally, the same map in Attachment I shows a new Sprint site, just north of Braly Park, which is not yet "on the air". It is almost certainly the same arrangement of antennas on a similar lattice tower, since it is located in the line of towers leaving the park, and it is listed as 91 feet tall.

If the facility antenna can be high above the surrounding structures, the carriers can have an effective installation. This is why I believe that something like placing an antenna high on an athletic field lighting tower in a park could result in a very effective facility in the midst of an otherwise residential area, with single-family homes.

The ground area REALLY needed by the carriers for their support equipment may not be as large as Sprint is requesting in this case (15 feet by 25 feet). Therefore, the area taken from park land for such facilities may not be as onerous as one might first think. You may be able to press applicants to apply for a minimum land area, to minimize the negative impact on a park facility, and better permit co-location of other carriers, again with minimum impact. I say this because we visited two other cellular base station facilities, a "tree pole" near the corner of Wolfe/Miller and Steven's Creek and a facility hidden in the façade of the dentist's office at the corner of Wolfe and Fremont. The tree-pole facility is out-in-the-open, in the midst of a parking lot behind a two-story office building. One corner of the parking lot has a dumpster, completely

surrounded by a decorative-wall enclosure. Two sides of the enclosure face into the parking lot, while the other two face into bushes and trees. On the larger of the later two walls, the carrier has placed essentially all of the support equipment! It is just two cabinets (with room for a third). On the small side, several smaller boxes, for connection of an emergency generator, are located. At the dentist's office site, we looked hard for any sign of the facility. Finally, on the north wall, surrounded by bushes, we found the familiar two cabinets, attached to the wall. An oversized "drain spout" was also seen, and probably leads the cables to the roof. We never did see any sign of the antennas themselves.

It seems clear from these two installations that a carrier can reduce the "footprint" of the ground support equipment, when necessary.

ATTACHMENT H

Andrew Miner - Re: Monopole at 800 Carlisle Way

From: Andrew Miner
To: Flarity, Carl
Date: 1/4/2005 8:34 AM
Subject: Re: Monopole at 800 Carlisle Way

Dear Mr. Flarity-

Sprint is proposing a new wireless communication structure for their PCS wireless phone service. It is not a WiFi system, it is for their cell phone service. Their technology uses a frequency band which should not interfere with any household electronics, such as your 2.4 GHz phone.

The staff report is not on the web site because it hasn't been completed yet. You can expect to see it on the website after 5 pm on Friday 1/21. I have the plans and a photosimulation in the file if you want to come see them.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.

Andrew Miner, AICP
Associate Planner
City of Sunnyvale
408 730-7707

>>> Carl Flarity <spam4carl@yahoo.com> 12/23/2004 9:40:42 AM >>>
Is this an antenna for cell phone or WiFi? Will it interfere with any household electronics? If this is WiFi it will interfere with 2.4 GHz cordless phones. If so, will Sprint replace cordless phones that become useless?

Also, your notice said there is a staff report about this on the www.Sunnyvale.ca.gov website. I visited the website but can't figure out how to find it.

-- Carl Flarity